

Docket No.: K-229

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

Jin Young Kim et al.

Serial No.: 09/695,976

Filed: October 26, 2000

Confirmation No.: 2954

Customer No.: 34610

Group Art Unit: 2673

Examiner: N. Patel

For: STRUCTURE AND DRIVING METHOD OF PLASMA DISPLAY PANEL

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

RECEIVED

APR 05 2004

Technology Center 2600

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
2011 South Clark Place
Customer Window, Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment
Crystal Plaza Two, Lobby, Room 1B03
Arlington, VA 22202

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated February 6, 2004 (and the Office Action dated January 2, 2004), applicants request reconsideration of the outstanding rejection. Claims 1-46 are pending in this application.

Applicants have received two Office Actions dated January 2, 2004 and February 6, 2004. On January 26, applicants contacted Supervisor Examiner Shalwala to request that the Japanese reference cited in the January 2 Office Action be forwarded to applicant (since it was missing). The February 6 Office Action contained an English-language Abstract of the cited Japanese reference. Applicants contacted Examiner Patel in an attempt to determine whether the January 2 Office Action was withdrawn in view of the February 6 Office Action (since the January 2 Office Action was insufficient for failure to provide a non-English reference). During a telephone conference on March 10, Examiner Patel indicated that applicants were to respond to the January 2 Office Action (rather than the February 6 Office Action). Examiner Patel



#16/RCZ 603
PATENT ROOM
4/6/04
K. Patel

Reply to Office Action dated January 2, 2004

indicated that the February 6 Office Action merely provided an English-language Abstract of the cited Japanese reference. Applicants respectfully request that this response be considered a response to both the January 2 Office Action and the February 6 Office Action.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Office Action's indication that claims 5, 6, 8-14, 16-29, 31-44 and 46 contain allowable subject matter.

The February 6 Office Action rejects claims 1, 2-4, 7, 15, 30 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over applicant's alleged admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of Derwent ACC No. 1998-511098 which has a translation of Japanese Patent JP 10222120 A. A copy of this English-language Japanese Abstract was forwarded with the February 6, 2004 Office Action (but not the January 2 Office Action).

Independent claim 1 recites a plurality of priming electrodes configured to increase the amount of priming particles in a discharge cell to reduce discharge lag formed one by one between a pair of sustain electrodes.

The Office Action asserts that AAPA does not show priming electrodes to increase the amount of priming electrodes in a discharge cell to reduce lag formed between a pair of sustain electrodes. The Office Action then asserts that the Japanese reference shows a PDP device that shortens discharge lag time between electrodes that prevents incorrect discharge. Applicants have reviewed the English-language Abstract of the Japanese reference. At best, the English-language Abstract merely discloses that an advantage is to shorten discharge lag time. The English-language Abstract is unclear regarding any features that shorten the discharge lag time. This reference only mentions shortening of discharge lag time. There is no suggestion of the

Reply to Office Action dated January 2, 2004

features to perform this advantage. Additionally, there is no suggestion for increasing the amount of priming particles. As such, the Office Action has not provided a reference (or combination) that teaches or suggests the claimed plurality of priming electrodes configured to increase the amount of priming particles in a discharge cell to reduce discharge lag formed one by one between a pair of sustain electrodes. At best, the English-language Abstract discloses shortening a discharge lag time. The Office Action does not even discuss all the claimed features. The Office Action never addresses increasing the amount of priming particles, namely because the reference does not disclose this feature. As such, the Office Action has not made a *prima facie* case of obviousness and has failed to provide references that teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Independent claim 1 therefore defines patentable subject matter.

Each of independent claims 7, 15, 30 and 45 define patentable subject matter for at least similar reasons. For example, independent claim 7 recites a plurality of priming electrodes configured to increase the amount of priming particles in a discharge cell to reduce discharge lag, where the method includes applying a common pulse, which is periodically turned on/off, to the priming electrodes. Independent claim 15 recites a first electrode configured to increase the amount of priming particles in a discharge cell to reduce discharge lag in response to an electrical pulse applied to the first electrode. Independent claim 30 recites priming particles in a discharge cell in response to an electrical pulse applied to a first electrode to reduce discharge lag. Finally, independent claim 45 recites a discharge cell and a means of forming priming particles in the discharge cell to reduce discharge lag. For similar reasons as set forth above, AAPA and the

English-language Abstract do not teach or suggest all the features of these claims. Thus, claims 7, 15, 30 and 45 define patentable subject matter for at least this reason. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-46 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **David C. Oren**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703-766-3701 DYK:DCO/kah

Date: April 2, 2004

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610